

**Draft Summary of the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)
August 14, 2001**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted a meeting for the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group on August 14, 2001 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present an informational summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting.

Introduction

Attendees were welcomed to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and list of meeting attendees with their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

The Facilitator noted Dick Dunkel's passing and suggested that the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group keep his spirit of participation in their thoughts.

Action Items – July 10, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group Meeting

A summary of the July 10, 2001 Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group is posted on the relicensing web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

- Action Item #LU15:** Include the definitions of aesthetics offered by the consultant to comply with action item #LU13 to determine if noise is an aesthetic issue in July 10, 2001 Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group Summary notes.
- Status: Completed. The following definitions of aesthetics were included in the July 10, 2001 Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group Summary notes:
1. Evaluation and considerations with the sensory quality of resources (sight, sound, smell, taste, and touch) and especially with respect to judgement about their pleasurable qualities.
 2. Pertaining to the quality of human perceptual experience (including sight, sound, smell, touch, taste, and movement) evoked by phenomena or elements or configurations of elements in the environment.
- Action Item #LU16:** Prepare revised Existing Information and Information Needs for Issue Sheets. Distribute to Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group prior to August 14 meeting.
- Status: Revised Issue Sheets were distributed for review and revision as part of this agenda.
- Action Item #LU17:** Provide additional copies of the Oroville Facilities Relicensing Newsletter to various locations throughout Oroville as requested.
- Status: On-going. Each DWR Resource Area Manager has been advised to respond to requests for the newsletter as needed. Future editions of the newsletter will be distributed to key locations identified by the consultant team and DWR staff.

Carryover Action Items

- Action Item #LU6:** Provide definitions of Issue Sheet and other commonly used terms and examples to the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group.

Status: Jim Martin of DWR responded that the original request for a list of definitions from the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group had been broadened to include similar requests in the other Work Groups. In response to this the consulting team has distributed a draft list of definitions to the RAMs for their review and revision. The revised draft list will be available to the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group at their next meeting.

Issue Sheet Development

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group reviewed revised draft Issue Sheets developed by the consulting team. The issue sheets included changes to the text made by the participants at last month's Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group meeting.

Before reviewing each revised Issue Sheet, the Facilitator reminded participants that the Issue Sheets are working tools to help the Work Group fashion study plans, and that they did not require much wordsmithing. She added that suggested revisions to Issue Statements would be handled at the Plenary Group level as part of the review of Scoping Document 1, and therefore did not need to be addressed further by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group. Steve Nachtman of the consulting team added that the Issue Sheets are working documents that help identify issue needs, which guide study plan development. He outlined the study plan development schedule and reminded the participants that draft study plans should be completed by December, with final study plans approved by the Plenary Group in February 2002. Steve added that two levels of study plan coordination are likely to occur. The Work Group will edit individual study plans to minimize duplication of effort. Additional coordination will occur between Resource Area Managers responsible for different Work Groups. Draft Study Lists will be developed and compared by all the RAMs representing the various Work Groups for potential consolidation and synergism. Study Plans developed within the Work Group and Task Force levels will then be passed on to the Plenary Group where additional evaluation will occur to avoid overlap across study plans from the different Work Groups. The complete set of Study Plans should be prepared and approved by the Plenary Group by February 2002.

One participant asked how this effort to identify potential overlap would deal with information derived from the environmental scoping process. Steve responded that data from environmental scoping (comments to the Scoping Document 1) would be used to adjust the study plans as necessary to satisfy the information needs identified during the scoping process. Steve emphasized that study plans are flexible enough to adapt to information gathered throughout the process. Studies may also be adjusted if needed after first year data has been collected using adaptive management techniques.

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group reviewed, revised and completed Issue Sheets LU1, LU2, LM1, LM2, LM3, LM4, A1, A2, A3 and A4. The revised Issue Sheets are appended to this summary as Attachment 4. The following paragraphs summarize additional comments or discussions beyond the revisions reflected in Attachment 4.

LU1

Craig Jones from the State Water Contractors commented that LU1 does not appear to have a focused approach to studies. He is concerned that there is not a clear nexus to project operations in many of the identified information needs, and that the Work Group may pursue studies that are not germane to relicensing. Craig pointed out that the Issue Statement included direct linkages to other resources but did not address an identified issue. He added that LU2 and several of the other Issue Sheets also included studies that were not relevant to the issue stated. He cautioned against 'going fishing' for issues through studies rather than focusing the studies on responding to issues that have been raised. Steve Nachtman responded that FERC does not necessarily focus on project impacts when evaluating land use and land management issues since the applicant has an additional responsibility to manage project lands consistent with existing management plans

and policies. Steve offered to provide the specific FERC guidelines and regulations regarding this issue. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed that LU1 will require input from other study efforts, and that the study plan would become more focused once this information was available.

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group discussed the specifics of grazing and its impacts on fuel loading, noxious weed abatement, and fire risk management. Jim Martin responded that the Environmental Work Group and the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group were sharing responsibility here. The Environmental Work Group would handle the environmental impacts from grazing (water quality), and the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group would study the land use aspects of the issue.

LM3

Craig Jones commented that LM3 was identical to Recreation Issue 5 in the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. He added the organizational details of recreation administration on facility lands would appear to be better suited for study by the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group. DWR agreed to review LM3 and R5 to determine if one could replace the other. Jim Martin will report back to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group September meeting.

A3 & A4

Craig Jones suggested that A3 was the development of implementation strategies for issues identified in A4. He suggested that A3 be made a resource goal of A4 and that any information needs and resource goals identified in A3 will be folded into A4. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to have the facilitator include A3 in A4 and provide the appropriate notation to A3 and A4.

Next Steps – Study Plan Development

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to form a Task Force consisting of participants with expertise at crafting study plans related to land use issues to develop draft Study Plans based on the Issue Sheets completed at this meeting. The Task Force will develop a study plan outline and, when necessary, consolidate information needs from separate Issue Sheets to avoid study overlap. Recognizing the time constraints for developing Study Plans, the Task Force agreed to meet once prior to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Groups September 11 meeting. The participants agreed to yield the September meeting to the Task Force in the event Task Force work is not completed. The Task Force will report back to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group at their next meeting. The Task Force will include a representative from each of the following:

Department of Water Resources
Consulting Team
Department of Parks and Recreation
Butte County
Department of Fish and Game
Forest Service
State Water Contractors
Local resident

The Task Force agreed to meet from 11:00 AM to 3:00 PM, on August 28, at the Lake Oroville Kelly Ridge Visitors Center. The Consulting Team agreed to develop a 'straw person' study plan proposal and distribute to the Task Force before their August 28 meeting.

Next Meeting

The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to meet on:

Date: Tuesday, September 11, 2001
Time: 6 to 10 PM
Location: Oroville Field Division

Agreements Made

1. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to form a Task Force to prepare draft Study Plans based on Issue Sheets.
2. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed to meet again on September 11, 2001 at 6 PM to 10 PM at the Oroville Field Division. The Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group agreed that the Task Force would use the September 11, 2001 date if draft Study Plans have not been completed.

Action Items

The following list of action items identified by the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

Action Item #LU18: Provide the specific FERC guidelines and regulations regarding Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics

Responsible: Consulting Team
Due Date: September 11, 2001

Action Item #LU19: Review LM3 and R5 to determine if one could replace the other. Report back to the Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group September meeting.

Responsible: Jim Martin, DWR; Dale Hoffman-Floerke DWR
Due Date: September 11, 2001

Action Item #LU20: Develop a 'straw person' study plan proposal and distribute to the Task Force before their August 28 meeting

Responsible: Consulting Team
Due Date: August 23, 2001

Action Item #LU21: Prepare draft study plans for Land Use, Land Management and Aesthetics Work Group review.

Responsible: Task Force
Due Date: September 11, 2001

Carryover Action Items

Action Item #LU6: Provide definitions of Issue Sheet and other commonly used terms and examples to the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group.
Status: Jim Martin of DWR responded that the original request for a list of definitions from the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group had been broadened to include similar requests in the other Work Groups. In response to this the consulting team has distributed a draft list of definitions to the RAMs for their review and revision. The revised draft list will be available to the Land Use, Land Management, and Aesthetics Work Group at their next meeting.

Index of Summary Attachments
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	Revised Issue Sheets – August 14, 2001